

Landerdale Lake, near
Elkhorn, Wis

Aug 189

My dear Dr Watson

I have found a
retired, quiet spot, under the shadow
of a big tree on the Lake-shore and
have gone over the proofs carefully -
First of all I desire to express my
thanks for the improvement wrought
through your critical correction - the
verbal corrections are almost without
exception such as commend themselves
at a glance - Personally, I do not like
the use of sterile for male - for it is
not concise and it is not good English
- but it may be better in a book that
will be largely used by High School
classes of both sexes.

Before passing on to some minor
details wherein I have revised your
revision and ~~which~~ wish to explain
why, let me say frankly that I can
not accept your proposed sequence
of the introduced species - If my work
presents any improvement ~~over~~ ^{over} that of the

earlier eds of the Manual it is mainly in
the grouping of the species! I gave this
matter, really, more thought, than you
with experience ~~in such matters~~
and trained the more rapid execution
would be likely to credit me with.

The natural order of sequence in *Salix*
is from the Amygdalineae - trees with 5-
androm flowers &c - to the dwarf alpine
S. arctica - I congratulated myself that
our few species lent themselves so kindly
to a sequence more apparently natural
in a larger series - The place for
fragilis in our flora is just after *lucida*
as in Eu it follows *pentandra* - The
relationship is good botany and sanctioned
by nature through the multitude of
spontaneous hybrids - *alba* naturally
follows *fragilis* and forms the nearest
known transition to *S. longifolia* - When
I ~~first~~ sent Buser his first really
good and full representation of *longifolia*
he remarked on its resemblance to *alba*
and begged me to examine *S. arctica*
carefully to see if the flowers were not
sometimes 3 androm - In a word my
judice - The series *supra*, *amygdaloides*

lucida fragilis alba longifolia - is good
every way and ought not to be
transposed -

S. purpurea has no close affinity
with any of our species - it is a mere
matter of convenience where we place
it - but I have two decided objections
to putting it at the head of the
2^d section - 1st and principally because
it shuts off *rostrata* which by its
tree like habit - pale scales - slender
pedicels - aments leafy - peduncled &c
makes the nearest approach of any species
of § 2 (~~with which I am acquainted~~) to
the character of § 1 - It is any interposition
which it were better to avoid if possible

2^d Not one student in 500 who uses
the book - (not one in 1000 out west) will
ever have occasion to identify *S. purpurea*
yet where it stands they must stumble
over it day after day to reach the
native species - It is furthermore not
a characteristic species really of the
section and is only placed in it to
avoid over multiplication of headings
- so I much prefer to place it at the
tail where it breaks in upon no

natural relationship between what
goes before and what follows - I am
glad that in your former letter you
expressed a willingness to restore the
first arrangement in case I desired
it. for I do really believe it is much
the best,

I want to ask you to restore a few
words under S. lucida which I imagine
struck you as unimportant but which I
feel both to omit - 1st I think the close
relationship (so close as to make questionable
the propriety of separation) with S. pentandra
of the order somehow to be mentioned -
I cut down a good deal when I framed
that sentence - Prof Dudley first described
a variety of S. lucida with retarded fruit -
He wanted me to name it. but I was not
altogether satisfied - and left the matter
wholly at his discretion - He finally named
this var in his Caryophylla flora leaving the
name - but according to the form in
separate number - and noticing what he
deemed a peculiarity - viz an excessively
close serration of the leaves - A year or
two later Bailey found the same thing in
N. Mex - I named the plant for him

or Carter told him what it was and
refused him to Dudley's work. He published
the variety as an addition to the Flora
of Minnesota - absolutely ignoring
Dudley, although Dudley's character gave
him his name, "serrissima" - It was
a little bit of just the kind of thing
I detest among botanists - and I fancy
I made Bailey mad by saying publicly
almost as much in a letter to him -
But when it came to studying *S. lucida*
for the Manual what disposition was to be
made of "var serrissima, Bailey! To my
surprise I found first that more than
half the *lucida* in my herb. was of
the retarded sort, 2^d that there was no
difference in the fineness of the
serratures - 3^d by reference to the extended
description of *pentandra* in Andersson's
monograph - that precisely the same
thing, was found in *S. pentandra* (as specimens
in my herb abundantly made evidence)
- Here was a happy solution of the
whole difficulty - Bailey will imagine
that I have given the go by to his
var serrissima - because he knocked
from Carey Bebbie in the head - or
because he thought Dudley's var

observation did not receive credit due
- but if the peculiarity is not varietal
and is shared by the majority of
specimens of the whole business!

Under S. sericea reduce the words
very silky to "Roman" - All the characters
given sericea and petiolaris are
contrasting ones - and the silky leaves
of sericea are not more important as
a distinguishing mark than the others -
The density and looseness of the anthers
and the relative length of the pedicels
are the best distinguishing characters - if
we seek to give prominence to any
- Perhaps as the species are closely related
and of questionable specific difference at
best - it may be just as well to let
both descriptions stand in solid Roman

S. physocarpa - "Pedicels 2-3 times the
length of the nectary" I observed last
spring, (after the PM had left my hands)
was a little too much - twice - (as I think
Carey has it) were better!

Under S. ordata. If the locality for
our vestita can not be worked in

somehow ^{the variety} were better stricken out
in total - It left as extensive in
distribution with the species. The students
east of the Mississippi will be perpetually
puzzling, thus he has found something
that will fit the description - I know just
how that works!

Under P. balsamifera - "stipules rarely
present" is not strong enough! They are
almost never present except on extra-
ordinary vegetation growths - and are
then but a little fugacious abortives -
When we consider the marked degree
in which large-remiform-conspicuous
stipules prevail throughout the cordatae
- usually persistent - and always the more
noticeably feature as compared with
Willows generally it is indeed strange that
a species - or clearly of the same group
should have no stipules at all - I thought
the fact deserved the prominence which I
gave it by saying, "stipules remarkably
absent for a species of the group" - but in
the interest of brevity I have now written
instead "stipules obsolete"

Under P. myrtillodes you had
drawn various pencil lines indicating

a transcription of the matter so as
to include all under D. myotillodes
var pedicellaris - But we have the
typical form (especially northward) and
the variety as well - The matter should
stand just as it appears in the
proof - and I have taken the liberty
(in this one instance only) to erase
your marks - The variety with oblong
linear leaves twice as large as ^{in the} the
type is certainly Anderssons - Pursh may
have included all the American
forms - I imagine he did - And of course
can not look the matter up here -

But enough, and you are perhaps
groaning under the impression that it
is altogether more than enough -

Please have printed for me 100
extras - It would do for the New York
House to ignore my request as they
did in the case of Corticus Flora, I
know too much - I know how quick
they can do something of this sort
when it is their interest so to do -

One of their agents called upon me in
my capacity as Director of the Rockford

City schools. He was talking botany
to work into my good grace) and
exhibiting Coulter's flora - I mentioned
in the most careless way imaginable
how I had failed to receive extras
- with out a thought of my words leading
to anything. - But ~~la~~ in less than
two weeks I was surprised by a
postal packet which proved to be the
extra sheets - all nicely stitched &c &c.
- It was intended for a bit of a bribe
bribe - but I accepted it as my
honest due - reflecting the while
on the relative importance of a
poor devil of a botanist - and a
school director upon whose vote some
money consideration might hang

Yours cordially

M. S. Galt

P.S. I do not feel altogether satisfied with the sections
preceding & cordata. The phrase "on vigorous shoots rounded,
truncate or cordate at base" ~~you will see that I have~~
~~struck out the comma after rounded - perhaps it would be~~
better to emphasize the whole phrase by separation by
semicolons, when the comma could be left - serrate
relates to all the leaves "rounded truncate or cordate" only
to those on vigorous shoots - (Would it be better to transition
serrate - placing it before "on vigorous shoots &c" instead of after
as it now stands. - On reflection this seems to me the better

the proof - relying upon your better judgment